



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/534,685

07/01/2005

Yanlong Shi

3402.1010-003

7421

22852

7590

12/18/2008

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER  
LLP

901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER

ZIMMER, ANTHONY J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1793

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/18/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/534,685	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SHI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> ANTHONY J. ZIMMER	<b>Art Unit</b> 1793	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 September 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1, “wherein the first ... autothermal reforming of the reactant mixture reacts” is indefinite as to what this is to mean with respect to “reacts.”

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 4-5, and 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Madgavkar '048.

In regard to claims 1 and 5, Madgavkar teaches a catalyst system having two different catalysts in different catalyst zones (portions); the first catalyst zone (the upstream portion) consisting of a first catalyst with a lower lightoff temperature (higher amount of platinum); and the second catalyst zone consists of a second catalyst with a higher lightoff temperature (less platinum). See column 2, lines 27-55. Example 5 utilizes such a catalyst system, wherein the first zone has a platinum content of 0.5%

Art Unit: 1793

and the second 0.3%. Example 4 characterizes these different catalysts as having a 50°C difference in lightoff temperature.

The catalyst of Madgavkar is considered to be an autothermal reforming catalyst because the catalyst of Madgavkar would be active in autothermal reforming as it contains active platinum. Also, the first and second catalysts meet the structural implications of the limitation that the catalysts promote autothermal reforming of an appropriate reactant mixture of fuel, steam, and air, as the catalysts contain active platinum which, as mentioned above, is active in autothermal reforming. (For instance see US4755498.) Therefore, the catalysts are capable of such a reaction, and thus meet the structural limitations of the claim. It should be noted that the manner of operating a device does not differentiate apparatus claims from prior art, as long as the structural implications are met. See MPEP 2114. The limitation that the catalyst system comprise a reactant mixture comprising fuel, air, and steam does not impart patentability as "expressions relating the apparatus to contents thereof during an intended operation are of no significance in determining patentability of an apparatus claim." See MPEP 2115. Even so, Madgavkar teaches combusting a hydrocarbon fuel (in air), which produces water vapor (steam) as a product.

In regard to claim 4, Madgavkar teaches both catalyst portions comprising a mixture of a low-lightoff temperature catalyst platinum and a high-lightoff temperature catalyst, mullite, (see Example 5) wherein the first portion has a higher percentage of the low-lightoff temperature catalyst (platinum) than the second portion as discussed above.

Art Unit: 1793

In regard to claim 9, Madgavkar teaches providing the catalyst system as discussed above, flowing preheated nitrogen and air over the catalyst, and introducing preheated hydrocarbon (and air) into the catalyst and allowing combustion to proceed. See column 7, lines 15-21. This process comprises heating the first catalyst to the first lightoff temperature (whether or not this temperature was reached using the heat from the preheated nitrogen/air, the preheated hydrocarbon/air, or heat of combustion).

In regard to claims 10 and 11, Madgavkar teaches combusting a hydrocarbon which produces and adds steam to the mixture of air and fuel, thus steam is continuously added throughout operation, including the period after the first lightoff temperature has been reached.

Claims 1, 3, and 5-12 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Le Gal '737.

In regard to claims 1, 3, and 5-8, Le Gal teaches a catalyst system comprising two catalyst portions (monoliths; See Figures) the first monolith containing palladium oxide (see column 4, lines 40-47) having a lightoff temperature of  $\sim 700^{\circ}\text{C}$  and the second monolith having a hexa-aluminate catalyst which has a self ignition (lightoff) temperature of  $1000^{\circ}\text{C}$  (a  $300^{\circ}\text{C}$  difference). See column 5, lines 44-58. Le Gal teaches the two monoliths in the same housing. See Figures.

The catalyst of Le Gal is considered to be an autothermal reforming catalyst because the catalyst of Le Gal would be active in autothermal reforming as it contains active palladium and other active catalyst components. Also, the first and second

Art Unit: 1793

catalysts meet the structural implications of the limitation that the catalysts promote autothermal reforming of an appropriate reactant mixture of fuel, steam, and air, as the catalysts contain the components mentioned above. (For instance see US4755498.)

Therefore, the catalysts meet the structural limitations of the claim. It should be noted that the manner of operating a device does not differentiate apparatus claims from prior art, as long as the structural implications are met. See MPEP 2114. The limitation that the catalyst system comprise a reactant mixture comprising fuel, air, and steam does not impart patentability as "expressions relating the apparatus to contents thereof during an intended operation are of no significance in determining patentability of an apparatus claim." See MPEP 2115. Even so, Le Gal teaches combusting a hydrocarbon fuel (in air), which produces water vapor (steam) as a product.

In regard to claims 9-12, Le Gal teaches providing the catalysts as required (see above), and introducing preheated fuel and air over the catalyst which reacts to heat the catalyst to at least the first lightoff temperature. See Examples 1 and 3. Combustion is carried out, and thus water vapor (steam) is produced and is thus added before and after the (first) catalyst reaches the first lightoff temperature.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 2-3 and 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Madgavkar.

See the 102 rejection above for the limitations of claim 1.

In regard to claims 2-3, Madgavkar is silent in regard to the housing of the catalyst. However, determination of the location/configuration of a catalyst within a production apparatus is a matter of design choice and routine optimization that depends on space considerations, equipment size requirements, and other design factors and fails to produce an unexpected result.

In regard to claims 6-8, Madgavkar does not teach an example having a difference in lightoff temperatures; however, Madgavkar does teach that the concentration of the lower lightoff component (platinum) affects the lightoff temperature, see Example 4, and also teaches a difference in platinum composition between the catalyst of the first zone and that of the second that would produce a lightoff temperature difference in the broad range of the claim. See claim 1. [For instance, a difference of 0.2% platinum (a ratio of platinum in the first to the platinum in the second catalyst of 1.67) produces a 50°C difference in lightoff temperature; and Madgavkar

Art Unit: 1793

teaches a ratio of up to 20] Overlapping ranges are *prima facie* obviousness. See MPEP 2144.05.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Le Gal.

See the 102 rejection above for the limitations of claim 1.

Le Gal fails to teach providing the catalyst portions in separate housings.

However, determination of the location/configuration of a catalyst within a production apparatus is a matter of design choice and routine optimization that depends on space considerations, equipment size requirements, and other design factors and fails to produce an unexpected result.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 9/9/2008 with respect to the rejection of claims 1-12 as being unpatentable over Borup '204 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejection of claims 1-12 over Borup has been withdrawn in this regard.

Applicant's arguments regarding Madgavkar '048 and Le Gal '737 filed 9/9/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In regard to both references, applicant argues that neither the reactant mixture of fuel, steam, and air nor autothermal reforming catalysts is taught. These limitations are addressed in the rejections above. Furthermore, it should be noted that "autothermal reforming catalyst" has not been defined to include or exclude any particular catalyst composition.

***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Gittleman '219 and Wheat '144 teach processes of rapid startup of fuel processors.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANTHONY J. ZIMMER whose telephone number is (571)270-3591. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 7:30 AM - 5:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stanley Silverman can be reached on 571-272-1358. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ajz

/Steven Bos/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1793